

### **REMARKS**

Claims 18, 23, 24 and 26-51 are now pending in the application. Claims 18, 24 and 38 are herein amended. Claims 19-22, 25, and 52 are herein canceled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 18-21, 23, 24, 26-28, 30-34, 38-45, 48, 49 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 197[7]5273 (patent number corrected during March 21, 2005 telecon identified herein) in view of Page et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,443,403). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted Applicants have amended Claim 18 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 22 (including the limitations of Claims 19-21) and Claims 19-22 have been herein canceled, rendering the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 19-21 moot. Claim 18 and Claim 23 which depends from amended Claim 18 should now be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 18 and 23.

It is also noted Applicants have amended Claim 24 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 25 and Claim 25 has been herein canceled. Therefore, Claim 24 and Claims 26-28 which depend from amended Claim 24 should now be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 24 and 26-28.

It is further noted Applicants have amended Claim 38 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 52 and Claim 52 has been herein canceled. Therefore, amended Claim 38 and Claims 39-45, 48, 49 and 51 which depend from amended Claim 38 should now be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 38, 39-45, 48, 49 and 51.

Concerning Claims 30-34, Applicants note that the DE 1975273 reference appears to teach spring fingers 11,12 which engage ledges 17a and 18a longitudinally created within an elongated slot 25 of a frame 15. See Figures 1 and 2. DE 1975273 appears to provide for “releasably joining the holder to the frame using the spring fingers.” Respectfully, DE 1975273 does not teach or suggest “locking the holder in a central position along the frame” as recited in Claim 30. DE 1975273 does not teach or suggest any capability to lock the holder or any way to identify a central position of and lock the holder at the central position of frame 15.

Page et al. teaches a retention portion 32 having a stem 38 with retention barbs 42 which engage within receiving apertures 25,27 of first and second receiving portions 24, 26 (see Figure 11 and column 4, lines 36-51. The part holder (bundling portion 20) of Page et al. does not have spring fingers and does not have spring fingers that releasably join the holder to the frame using the spring fingers as recited in Claim 30. Page et al. therefore does not teach or suggest either releasably joining the holder to the frame using the spring fingers, or locking the holder in a central position along the frame as recited in Claim 30.

The combination of DE 1975273 with Page et al. therefore cannot render Claim 30 obvious. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claim 30. Because Claims 31-34 depend from Claim 30, the combination of DE 1975273 with Page et al. cannot render Claims 31-34 obvious for at least the same reasons. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 31-34.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 22, 25, 29, 35, 36, 37, 46, 47, 50 and 52 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants initially note Claims 35, 36 and 37 as originally written are in independent form. Per telephonic discussion between Applicants' representative Thomas Krul and the Examiner on March 21, 2005, the Examiner noted that the status of Claims 35, 36 and 37 should therefore be changed to allowed. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during this discussion, and for indication of allowed subject matter. No amendments to Claims 35, 36 or 37 have therefore been made.

Applicants have amended Claim 18 to include the limitations of Claims 19-22 and Claims 19-22 have been herein canceled. Therefore, amended Claim 18 and Claim 23 which depends from Claim 18 should now be in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended Claim 24 to include the limitations of Claim 25 and Claim 25 has been herein canceled. Therefore, Claim 24 and Claims 26-29 which depend from Claim 24 should now be in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended Claim 38 to include the limitations of Claim 52 and Claim 52 has been herein canceled. Therefore, Claim 38 and Claims 39-51 which depend from Claim 38 should now be in condition for allowance.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 22, 2005

By:   
Thomas J. Krul, Reg. No. 46,842

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MLF/TJK/mmk